

NON-PROJECT REVIEW FORM

1) **Background**

a) Proponent.

Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program
Washington State Department of Ecology
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

b) Proponent Contact.

Melissa Gildersleeve

c) Designated Responsible Official.

Gordon White, Manager
Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program
Washington Department of Ecology
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

d) SEPA Lead Agency Contact Person.

Derek I. Sandison
Central Regional Office
Department of Ecology
15 West Yakima Avenue, Suite 200
Yakima, WA 98902

Phone: (509) 574-3992
Fax: (509) 575-2809
Email: dsan461@ecy.wa.gov

e) Name of proposal, if any, and brief description.

The proposal consists of local development and adoption of watershed plans under provisions of the Watershed Management Act (Chapter 90.82 RCW). Through passage of that act, the Washington State Legislature established a comprehensive and cooperative method for assessment of the current status of water resources in the various watersheds within the state and for local development of watershed plans for management of such resources. Chapter 90.82 RCW creates a framework for addressing the state's water resource and water quality issues, establishing instream flows, and addressing salmon habitat

needs. The act provides local governments throughout the state the opportunity and funding to engage in watershed planning.

f) Description of planning process schedule/timeline.

Watershed planning conducted under Chapter 90.82 RCW may be initiated for a Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) only with the concurrence of the initiating governments within the WRIA. The initiating governments include: all counties within the WRIA, the largest city or town within the WRIA, and the water supply utility obtaining the largest quantity of water from the WRIA. The aforementioned entities must invite all tribes with reservation lands within the WRIA to participate as an initiating government.

In cases where a watershed planning area consists of multiple WRIsAs, the initiating governments include: all counties within the multi-WRIA planning area, the largest city or town within each WRIA, and the water supply utility obtaining the largest quantity of water from each WRIA. As with single WRIA planning efforts, the aforementioned entities must invite all tribes with reservation lands within the multi-WRIA area to participate as an initiating government.

The initiating governments for each WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area are responsible for selecting a lead agency for watershed planning. The lead agency coordinates staff support and receives grants from the Department of Ecology (Ecology) to fund the watershed planning process. Under Chapter 90.82 RCW, watershed planning activities are divided into three distinct phases: 1) organization, 2) technical assessment, and 3) plan development and approval. These phases are then followed by plan implementation.

(i) Phase 1 – Organization

During Phase 1 of watershed planning, the initiating governments for each WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area are required to organize a planning unit. The planning unit, whose membership is comprised of representatives of a wide range of water resource interests, is responsible for development of the watershed plan. Additionally, the initiating government must establish the initial scope of watershed planning in Phase 1; although, the scope may be modified during subsequent phases. The scope of planning must include a water quantity component and may, at the discretion of the initiating governments, also include instream flow, water quality, and habitat components. By December 1, 2001, or within one year of initiating Phase 1 of watershed planning, whichever occurs later, the initiating governments for each WRIA in which watershed planning has commenced must decide, by majority vote, whether to include an instream flow component in its watershed plan. The initiating governments, in consultation with state government, other local governments, and affected tribal governments, establish the watershed planning process and protocols during Phase 1. Phase 1 may also involve determination of goals and objectives for the watershed plan;

development of a work plan, budget, and schedule for subsequent phases; prioritization of issues; formation of special committees; development of a public involvement process; and establishment of a data management program.

(ii) Phase 2 – Technical Assessment

Once Phase 1 is completed, funding is made available by Ecology for Phase 2, the technical assessment. The technical assessment consists of an evaluation of the status of water resources within each WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area, and provides information necessary to support plan development. Generally, planning units take a tiered approach to conducting their technical assessments. Initial assessment activities, referred to as a level 1 assessment, consists of compilation and review of existing data. A level 2 assessment involves collection of new data to fill data gaps identified in the level 1 assessment and to support well-defined decision making needs within the time frame of the watershed planning process. A level 3 assessment involves long-term monitoring initiated after adoption of a watershed management plan to support adaptive management of the watershed.

(iii) Phase 3 – Plan Development and Approval

In Phase 3, the watershed plan development and approval phase, the planning unit determines how best to manage the water resources of the WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area to supply water in sufficient quantities to satisfy the minimum instream flows for fish and to provide water for future out of stream uses. A watershed plan includes recommendations for actions to be taken by local, state, and federal agencies; tribes; private property owners; private organizations; and individual citizens in support of effective watershed management.

The plan approval process stipulated in RCW 90.82.130 involves two-steps: approval by the planning unit followed with approval by the jurisdictional county legislative authority or authorities. Under RCW 90.82.130, a watershed plan must be approved by the planning unit and submitted to the jurisdictional county legislative authority or authorities within four years of the date upon which Phase 2 funding is first drawn. Upon completing a watershed plan, the planning unit may approve the plan by consensus of all members of the planning unit, or by consensus of the planning unit members that represent units of government and a majority vote of the nongovernmental members. The watershed plan is then submitted to the county legislative authority or authorities with land use jurisdiction over lands within the WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area. If a watershed plan is not approved by the planning unit, the planning unit may submit components of the plan for which consensus has been achieved to the county legislative authority or authorities.

Once in receipt of the planning unit approved watershed plan, the jurisdictional county legislative authority or authorities must provide public notice of, and conduct a public hearing on the proposed watershed plan. After the public

hearing or hearings, the jurisdictional county legislative authority or authorities must convene a session to approve of the proposed watershed plan. In cases where there is more than one county legislative authority with jurisdiction over the WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area, the legislative authorities must convene a joint session to consider the proposed plan. A jurisdictional county legislative authority may reject the plan, but may not amend it. Under RCW 90.82.130, approval of a watershed plan can be achieved by a majority vote of the members of the jurisdictional county legislative authority, or in cases where there is more than one county legislative authority with jurisdiction over the WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area, a majority of vote of each county legislative authority.

If a proposed plan is rejected by one or more jurisdictional county legislative authority, it must be returned to the planning unit with recommendations for revisions. The approval process for a revised plan is the same as that described above for the original watershed plan. If approval of the revised plan is not achieved, watershed planning under provision of Chapter 90.82 RCW terminates.

As stipulated in RCW 90.82.130, once a watershed plan is approved, actions identified within the plan to be taken by local, state, and tribal governments that impose a fiscal impact, a redeployment of resources, or a change in existing policy for such governments are considered “obligations.” However, obligations cannot be created by a watershed plan unless the government entity to which the obligation will apply was represented on the planning unit and the representative for the entity is on record as agreeing to the obligation.

(iv) Implementation

Agencies of state government must adopt rules and/or take other actions necessary to fulfill their obligations under each approved watershed plan. Similarly, the jurisdictional county legislative authority or authorities for each approved plan must adopt any necessary implementing ordinances and take any other action necessary to fulfill obligations as soon as possible after plan approval.

Financial support for such implementation activities are likely to require a combination of existing and new funding sources. The 2001 legislature directed Ecology to facilitate establishment of a panel to evaluate options for funding implementation activities and to address other potential implementation issues. The panel will be comprised of stakeholders, the legislature, county and city governments, tribal governments, and the public at large. The panel will provide an interim report to the 2002 legislature and a final report, including recommendations, to the 2003 legislature.

g) Describe the jurisdiction or area where the proposal is applicable.

This nonproject action applies statewide to all Water Resources Inventory Areas (WRIAs) in which watershed planning under provisions of Chapter 90.82 RCW is currently in process, or may occur in the future.

Currently, 41 of the state's 62 WRIAs are in the processing of organizing, conducting technical assessments, or planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW, including eight multi-WRIA planning efforts. Applications for two additional WRIAs have been received by Ecology; however, those applications were incomplete. Table 1 provides a listing of those WRIAs for which watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW has been initiated, the current status of the planning effort, the completion date for the watershed plan, and the elements to be included in the plan. Figure 1 demonstrates the location and boundaries of the state's WRIAs.

TABLE 1
WATERSHED PLANNING STATUS/SCHEDULE

WRIA	PLANNING PHASE	PLANNED COMPLETION DATE	PLANNING ELEMENTS (as of 12/31/01)			
			Water Quantity	Instream Flows	Water Quality	Habitat
#1 – Nooksack	2 & 3	Fall 2003	X	X	X	X
#2 – San Juan	2 & 3	Fall 2003	X		X	X
#3 – Lower Skagit/ #4 – Upper Skagit	2 & 3	Fall 2003	X	X		
#5 – Stillaguamish	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#6 – Island	2	Spring 2005	X			
#7 – Snohomish	Startup	To be determined	X			
#8 – Cedar – Sammamish	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#9 – Duwamish – Green	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#10 Puyallup	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#11 – Nisqually	2	Fall 2003	X	X	X	X
#12 – Chambers – Clover	2 & 3	Fall 2004	X		X	X
#13 – Deschutes	2 & 3	Fall 2004	X	X	X	X
#14 – Kennedy – Goldsborough	2 & 3	Fall 2005	X	X	X	X
#15 – Kitsap	2	Spring 2005	X	X	X	X
#16 – Skokomish – Dosewallips	2 & 3	Fall 2005	X	X	X	X
#17 – Quilcene – Snow	2 & 3	Winter 2004	X	X	X	X
#18 – Elwha – Dungeness	2 & 3	Fall 2003	X	X	X	X
#19 – Lyre – Hoko/ #20 – Solduck	2	Summer 2005	X	X	X	X
#21 – Queets – Quinault	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#22 – Lower Chehalis/ #23 – Upper Chehalis	2 & 3	Winter 2003	X		X	X

TABLE 1
WATERSHED PLANNING STATUS/SCHEDULE

WATER RESOURCE INVENTORY AREA	PLANNING PHASE	PLANNED COMPLETION DATE	PLANNING ELEMENTS (as of 12/31/01)			
			Water Quantity	Instream Flows	Water Quality	Habitat
#24 – Willipa	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#25 – Grays – Elochoman/ #26 – Cowlitz	2 & 3	Summer 2004	X	X	X	X
#27 – Lewis/ #28 – Salmon – Washougal	2 & 3	Summer 2004	X	X	X	X
#29 – Wind – White Salmon	2	Spring 2005	X	X	X	X
#30 – Klickitat	1	To be determined	X		X	X
#31 – Rock – Glade	Startup	To be determined	X			
#32 – Walla Walla	2 & 3	Summer 2005	X	X	X	X
#33 – Lower Snake	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#34 – Palouse	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#35 – Middle Snake	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#36 – Esquatzel Coulee	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#37 – Lower Yakima/ #38 – Naches/ #39 – Upper Yakima	3	Fall 2003	X	X (no flows for WRIA 38)	X	X
#40 – Alkali – Squilchuck	Application filed but incomplete					
#41 – Lower Crab Creek	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#42 – Grand Coulee	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#43 – Upper Crab Creek	1	To be determined	X	X		
#44 – Moses Coulee/ #50 – Foster Creek	2	Fall 2004	X	X	X	X
#45 – Wenatchee	2	Summer 2005	X	X	X	X
#46 – Entiat	2	Fall 2003	X	X	X	X

TABLE 1
WATERSHED PLANNING STATUS/SCHEDULE

WATER RESOURCE INVENTORY AREA	PLANNING PHASE	PLANNED COMPLETION DATE	PLANNING ELEMENTS (as of 12/31/01)			
			Water Quantity	Instream Flow	Water Quality	Habitat
#47 – Chelan	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#48 – Methow	2	Fall 2003	X		X	X
#49 – Okanogan	Application filed, But incomplete					
#51 – Nespelum	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#52 – Sanpoil	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#53 – Lower Lake Roosevelt	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#54 – Lower Spokane	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#55 – Little Spokane/ #57 – Middle Spokane	2	Winter 2004	X	X	X	
#56 – Hangman	2	Fall 2004	X	X	X	X
#58 – Middle Lake Roosevelt	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#59 – Colville	2 & 3	Fall 2004	X		X	X
#60 – Kettle	Startup	To be determined	X	X		
#61 – Upper Lake Roosevelt	Currently no Chapter 90.82 RCW planning					
#62 – Pend Oreille	2 & 3	Fall 2004	X		X	X

FIGURE 1
WRIA MAP

f) What is the legal mandate for the proposal?

Chapter 90.82 RCW establishes a framework for watershed planning to address the state's water resource and water quality issues, as well as to establish instream flows and address salmon habitat needs. While local governments are not required to perform watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW, those that accept funding from Ecology for that purpose must conduct planning in accordance with the provisions of that RCW.

2) Need and Objective.

a) Describe the problem to be addressed and the need for action

Within many of the state's watersheds, significant water resource issues have arisen concerning diminishing water availability, declining water quality, and loss of critical habitat for fish and wildlife. Past efforts to manage water resources through statewide planning as well as statewide policy and regulatory development and implementation have generally been unsuccessful in addressing the aforementioned issues because such efforts failed to account for local variability in socioeconomic, political, and natural resource conditions.

In passage of Chapter 90.82 RCW, the legislature determined that local development of watershed plans for managing water resources and for protecting existing water rights is vital to both state and local interests. Local development of such plans serves vital local interests by placing it in the hands of people who have:

- The greatest knowledge of both the resources and the aspirations of those who live and work in watersheds, and
- The greatest stake in the proper, long-term management of the resources.

The legislature also found that the development of watershed plans serves the state's vital interests by ensuring that the state's water resources are used wisely, by protecting existing water rights, by protecting instream flows for fish, and by providing for the economic well-being of the state's citizenry and communities.

b) Describe the primary objective(s) of the proposal

The objective of watershed plans developed under Chapter 90.82 RCW is to supply water in sufficient quantities to satisfy the minimum instream flows for fish and to provide water for future out-of-stream uses for water, as well as to ensure that adequate water supplies are available for agriculture, energy production, and population and economic growth consistent with of the state's

Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A RCW). In addition, watershed plans may incorporate plan components that are intended to:

- Provide recommendations for modifications to instream flows already adopted by rule, or to set, in a collaborative process between Ecology and individual planning units as described in RCW 90.82.080 (1) (a) (ii), instream flows for streams for which instream flows have not previously been adopted;
- Provide a recommended approach for implementing total maximum daily loads established by the department for achieving compliance with water quality standards in nonmarine waters within a WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area; and
- Protect or enhance fish habitat in a WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area.

c) Are there any other objectives? If so, please describe.

Most planning units have or will develop objectives specific to their WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area as part of watershed plan development.

d) What are the current known or anticipated key environmental issues or areas of controversy or concern?

Key environmental issues and areas of controversy and concern vary from WRIA to WRIA. Streams in a number of WRIsAs in both western and eastern Washington are considered by Ecology to be overappropriated. In a number of other WRIsAs, growth and development pressures and agricultural demand for water supplies are straining limited water resources. The listing of a number of fish species by the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act has heightened debate over issues associated with the allocation of water among various competing beneficial uses.

This creates a difficult environment within which the consensus based watershed planning process established under Chapter 90.82 must operate. For a watershed plan to be adopted and to be successful, acceptance of the plan by a wide range of interests will be necessary. As planning progresses from broad concepts to specific recommendation for management strategies relating to water quantity, instream flows, water quality, and habitat, it may be a significant challenge to maintain consensus among planning unit members and to achieve the political acceptance needed for adoption.

The timing of watershed planning in relation to the timing of updates for other land and water use plans may be an issue, especially for those WRIA and multi-WRIA management areas that only recently began planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW. The legislature has directed each county and city to “take action” to

review their Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A RCW) comprehensive plans and development regulations and, if needed, revise such plans and regulations, to ensure compliance with the Growth Management Act no later than September 1, 2002. Subsequent reviews and updates would occur not less than once every five years thereafter. As part of that review, a number of local entities will be reviewing and possibly revising their shoreline master programs to ensure that they are consistent with critical areas and best available science provisions of the Growth Management Act. Since comprehensive plans, development regulations, and shoreline master programs can be important tools for implementing recommended actions of watershed plans, timely coordination among those involved in these efforts will be vital.

Similarly, there is a need to coordinate watershed planning efforts with salmon recovery efforts that are occurring throughout much of the state since the two efforts have somewhat similar objectives.

The adequacy of funding to support implementation of watershed plans is a concern for most planning units around the state. Additionally, concerns have been expressed over the availability of funding for ongoing monitoring of implementation activities to support an adaptive management process.

Key environmental issues within WRIs for which watershed planning is being conducted under Chapter 90.82 RCW will be evaluated in the statewide non-project EIS for watershed planning. Issues to be addressed for each of the four watershed planning components follow.

(i) Water Quantity Component

- Impacts to public services and utilities associated with implementation of municipal conservation programs.
- Short-term impacts to earth, air, and environmental health from construction activities associated with agricultural water conservation and irrigation efficiency efforts.
- Long-term impacts to microclimates, ground water recharge, surface water temperature, plants and animals, and land and shoreline use associated with agricultural water conservation and irrigation efficiency efforts.
- Impacts to publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities associated with industrial conservation measures.
- Long-term impacts to land use, aesthetics, and ground water recharge associated with voluntary transfers of water and changes in water use.

- Short-term impacts to earth, air, surface water, plants and animals, environmental health, and traffic associated with construction of water reclamation and reuse facilities.
- Impacts to ground and surface water quality and quantity, land and shoreline use, and public health associated with operation of water reclamation and reuse facilities.
- Short-term impacts to earth, air, surface water, plants and animals, environmental health, and traffic associated with construction of new on-channel or off-channel storage facilities, raising of existing storage facilities, or implementing artificial recharge/aquifer storage projects.
- Seismic effects and impacts to stream ecology, wildlife habitat, land and shoreline use, and energy associated with operation of new on-channel or off-channel storage facilities, or raised existing storage facilities.
- Short-term and long-term impacts to surface water quality, recreation, aesthetics, and public services and utilities associated with installation, operation, and maintenance of water quantity monitoring devices.

(ii) Instream Flows Component

- Long-term impacts to surface water, ground water, land and shoreline use, aesthetics, recreation, and cultural resources associated with setting of instream flows and with implementation of actions intended to achieve instream flows once set.

(iii) Water Quality Component

- Short-term and long-term impacts to surface water quality, recreation, and public services and utilities associated with development and operation of monitoring programs, including installation and maintenance of monitoring devices.
- Long-term impacts to land and shoreline use associated with modifications to comprehensive plans, shoreline master programs, critical areas ordinances, stormwater plans, and on-site sewage regulations intended to reduce non-point pollution and to implement total mass daily loads established for federal 303 d listed water bodies.

(iv) Habitat Component

- Short-term construction related impacts to earth, air, surface water, plants and animals, environmental health, and traffic associated with placement of

instream structures, riparian restoration projects, and removal of fish passage obstructions.

- Impacts to recreation and aesthetics associated with placement of instream structures and riparian restoration projects.
- Long-term impacts to traffic and public services and utilities associated with removal of fish passage obstructions such as bridges, culverts, and roadways.

3) Previous Documentation

a) Identify and briefly describe any similar or related plan, regulation, policy, etc. currently in effect governing this geographic area and that contains the means to further the primary objective.

A substantial number of federal, state, local, and tribal plans, programs, regulations, and/or policies in effect within the state's WRIAs that serve to or could serve to advance the objectives of watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW. Examples of such plans, programs, regulations, and policies follow.

(i) Plans, Programs, and Associated Policies:

- Local Growth Management Act comprehensive plans prepared under Chapter 36.70A RCW
- Tribal land use plans
- Water Cleanup Plans (Total Mass Daily Load) under Section 303d of the federal Clean Water Act
- Habitat Conservation Plans under the federal Endangered Species Act
- Strategies or action plans developed by lead entities for salmon recovery planning under Chapter 77.85 RCW
- Ground Water Management Programs/Plans prepared under Chapter 90.44 RCW and Chapter 173-100 WAC
- Irrigation district water quality programs under Chapter 87.03 RCW
- Joint control irrigation district board water quality programs under Chapter 87.80 RCW
- Public water system Wellhead Protection/Source Protection Programs

- Group A public water system plans under Chapter 246-290 WAC, including conservation plans
- Local non-point pollution (watershed) plans prepared under Chapter 400-12 WAC
- Coordinated Water System Plans prepared under 70.116 RCW and Chapter 246-293 WAC
- Local Shoreline Master Programs prepared under 90.58 RCW

(ii) Water Quantity and In-Stream Flow Related Rules and Regulations:

- Chapter 90.03 RCW, Water Code
- Chapter 90.14 RCW, Water Rights-Registration-Waiver and Relinquishment
- Chapter 90.16 RCW, Appropriation of Water for Public and Industrial Purposes
- Chapter 90.22 RCW, Minimum Water Flows and Levels
- Chapter 90.24 RCW, Regulation of Outflows from Lakes
- Chapter 90.38 RCW, Yakima River Basin Water Rights
- Chapter 90.40 RCW, Water Rights of the United States
- Chapter 90.42 RCW, Water Resource Management
- Chapter 90.44 RCW, Regulation of Public Ground Waters
- Chapter 90.46 RCW, Reclaimed Water Use
- Chapter 90.54 RCW, Water Resources Act of 1971
- Chapter 90.66 RCW, Family Farm Water Act
- Chapter 90.80 RCW, Water Conservancy Boards
- Chapter 173-500 WAC, Water Resources Management Program Established Pursuant to the Water Resources Act of 1971
- Chapter 173-501 WAC – Chapter 173-559 WAC, instream resources protection programs and water resources programs for individual WRIsAs

- Chapter 173-563 WAC, Instream Resources Protection Program for the Main Stem Columbia River in Washington State
- Chapter 173-564 WAC, Water Resources Management Program for the Main Stem of the Snake River in Washington State
- Chapter 173-590 WAC, Procedures Relating to the Reservation of Water for Future Public Water Supply
- Chapter 173-591 WAC, Reservation of Future Public Water Supply for Thurston County
- Chapter 173-592 WAC, Reservation of Future Public Water Supply for Clark County
- Local zoning and land use codes

(iii) Water Quality Related Rules and Regulations:

- Federal Clean Water Act
- Chapter 15.58 RCW, Washington Pesticide Control Act
- Chapter 18.104 RCW, Water Well Construction
- Chapter 78.44 RCW, Surface Mining
- Chapter 78.56 RCW, Metals Mining and Milling Operations
- Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control Act
- Chapter 90.64, Dairy Nutrient Management Act
- Chapter 90.71 RCW, Puget Sound Water Quality Protection
- Chapter 173-160 WAC, Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Wells
- Chapter 173-200, Ground Water Quality Standards
- Chapter 173-201A, Water Quality Standards
- Chapter 173-226 WAC, Waste Discharge General Permit Program

- Chapter 173-303 WAC, Dangerous Waste Regulations
- Chapter 173-304 WAC, Minimum Function Standards for Solid Waste Handling
- Chapter 246-272 WAC, On-Site Sewage System (rules and regulations of the State Board of Health)
- Local on-site sewage system and nonpoint pollution regulations
- Local Critical Areas Ordinances adopted pursuant to the state Growth Management Act

(iv) Habitat Rules and Regulations:

- Federal Endangered Species Act
- Federal Clean Water Act
- Chapter 75.20 RCW, Construction Projects in State Waters
- Chapter 76.04 RCW, Forest Protection Act
- Chapter 77.15 RCW, Fish and Wildlife Enforcement Code
- Chapter 77.85 RCW, Salmon Recovery Act
- Chapter 79.90 RCW, Aquatic Lands – In General
- Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control Act
- Chapter 90.58 RCW, Shoreline Management Act of 1971
- Chapter 90.72 RCW, Shellfish Protection Districts
- Chapter 90.84 RCW, Wetland Mitigation Banking
- Chapter 220-110 WAC, Hydraulics Code Rules
- Chapter 232-14 WAC, State Hydraulic Code Guidelines
- Local critical areas ordinances adopted pursuant to the state Growth Management Act

b) Is this proposal likely to result in an amendment to or replacement of such existing plan, regulation, or policy? Briefly describe.

RCW 90.82.130 stipulates that watershed plans shall not change existing local ordinances or existing state rules or permits; however, such plans may recommend creation of or modification to state and local regulations, including rule making to establish instream flows or to support implementation of local watershed plans. Similarly, watershed plans may recommend modifications to related plans, programs, and policies.

RCW 90.82.130 further stipulates that watershed plans shall not contain provisions that:

- Are in conflict with existing state statutes, federal laws, or tribal treaty rights;
- Impair or diminish an existing water right;
- Require modification of the operation of a federal reclamation project with a priority date before June 11, 1998;
- Affect or interfere with an ongoing general adjudication of water rights;
- Require modification of a wastewater discharge permit issued under Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control Act;
- Modify or require modification of activities or actions to protect or enhance fish habitat if the activities or actions are part of an approved habitat conservation plan and an incidental take permit, an incidental take statement, a management or recovery plan, or other cooperative or conservation agreement entered into with a federal or state fish and wildlife protection agency;
- Modify or require modification of activities or actions to protect or enhance fish habitat if the activities or actions are part of a water quality program adopted by an irrigation district under Chapter 87.03 RCW, Irrigation Districts Generally, or a joint board of control under Chapter 87.80 RCW, Joint Control Irrigation Districts; or
- Create any obligation or restrictions on forest practices in addition to or inconsistent with Chapter 76.09 RCW, the Forest Practices Act.

- c) List any environmental documents (SEPA or NEPA that have been prepared for items identified in 3a above. Identify the type of document, lead agency, and issue date.**

A complete listing of relevant, previously prepared environmental documents will be provided in the statewide nonproject EIS for watershed planning. Some of these documents will either be incorporated by reference in accordance with WAC 197-11-635, or will be adopted pursuant to WAC 197-11-630.

- d) Do the SEPA documents adequately analyze any or all of the impacts from the alternatives being considered?**

No. A statewide nonproject EIS will be prepared to generally address probable significant adverse environmental impacts associated with watershed planning conducted under provisions of Chapter 90.82 RCW. Additional environmental review will be conducted at a local level for each individual watershed plan, which may involve preparation of an addendum to the statewide nonproject EIS or preparation of a supplemental EIS.

4) Alternative Approaches

- a) Briefly describe any legal or other mandate that requires a particular approach?**

(i) Approach to Technical Assessments

In accordance with RCW 90.82.070, at a minimum, a technical assessment must include:

- An estimate of the surface and ground water present in the watershed planning area;
- An estimate of the surface and ground water available for beneficial uses within the watershed planning area, taking into consideration seasonal and other variations;
- An estimate of the water in the watershed planning area represented by claims in the water rights claims registry, water use permits, certificated rights, existing minimum instream flow rules, federally reserved rights, and other rights to water;
- An estimate of the surface and ground water actually being used in the watershed planning area;

- An estimate of the water needed in the future for use in the watershed planning area;
- An identification of the location of areas where aquifers are known to recharge surface water bodies and areas known to provide recharge of aquifers from the surface; and
- An estimate of the surface and ground water available for further appropriation, taking into account the minimum instream flows adopted by rule or to be adopted by rule for streams in the watershed planning area including the data needed to evaluate necessary flows for fish.

If a watershed plan includes a water quality component, RCW 90.82.090 requires that the technical assessment include the following:

- An examination, based on existing studies conducted by federal, state, and local agencies, of the extent to which legally established water quality standards are being met within the watershed planning area;
- An evaluation, based on existing studies conducted by federal, state, and local agencies, of the causes of water quality violations in the watershed planning area, including an assessment of information regarding pollutants, point and nonpoint sources of pollution, and pollution carrying capacity of water bodies in the planning area, taking into consideration seasonal stream flow and level variations, natural events, and pollution from natural sources that occurs independent of human activities;
- An assessment of the legally established characteristic uses of each of the nonmarine water bodies in the watershed planning area;
- An examination of any total maximum daily load established for nonmarine water bodies in the watershed planning area, unless a total maximum daily load process has commenced in the planning area as of the date the watershed planning process is initiated under RCW 90.82.060; and
- An evaluation of existing data related to the impact of fresh water on marine water quality, where applicable.

(ii) Approach to Watershed Plans

Chapter 90.82 RCW requires that the scope of a watershed plan must include a water quantity component or element and may, at the option of the initiating governments, include instream flow, water quality, and habitat components. Strategies identified within Chapter 90.82 RCW for addressing water quantity issues in a WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area include:

- Water conservation,
- Water reuse,
- Use of reclaimed water,
- Voluntary water transfers,
- Aquifer recharge and recovery,
- Additional water allocations, or
- Additional water storage or water storage enhancements.

In WRIAs or multi-WRIA planning areas where the initiating governments agree, by majority vote, to include an instream flow component, the approach to that component must conform with conditions stipulated in RCW 90.82.080. Instream flows that have already been adopted by rule for streams within WRIA or multi-WRIA planning areas can only be proposed for modification if all local government and tribal members of the planning unit that are present for a recorded vote unanimously vote to request Ecology to make such modifications.

If instream flows have not been adopted by rule for streams within WRIA or multi-WRIA planning areas, instream flows are to be set in a collaborative process between the planning unit and Ecology. Proposed instream flows established in that manner will be considered approved if all government and tribal members of the planning unit that are present for a recorded vote unanimously vote to support the proposed flows along with a majority of nongovernment members present for the same recorded vote.

Once approved, Ecology can adopt the instream flows by rule either by the rules adoption process set forth in Chapter 34.05 RCW, the expedited rules adoption process in RCW 34.05.230, or through a rules adoption process that uses public hearings and notice provided by the jurisdictional county legislative authority. Preparation of a small business economic impact statement under RCW 34.05.328 is not required for instream flow rule making. If approval is not achieved on instream flows within four years of the date that a planning unit first received funds for a Phase 2 technical assessment, Ecology may initiate rule making and would have an additional two years to establish such flows. Prior to setting instream flows, Ecology is required to engage in government-to-government consultation with affected tribes.

If initiating governments choose to include a water quality component in their watershed plan, the plan must include the following:

- A recommended approach for implementing the total daily maximum load established for achieving compliance with water quality standards for nonmarine water bodies in the watershed planning area unless a total maximum daily load process has begun in the planning area as of the date the Watershed planning process is initiated; and
- A recommended means of monitoring by appropriate government agencies whether actions taken to implement the approach to improvements in water quality are sufficient to achieve compliance with water quality standards.

However, planning units, lead agencies, or local governments are precluded from establishing or adopting water quality standards or total maximum daily loads under the federal clean water act.

If initiating governments choose to include a habitat component in their watershed plan, the plan must be coordinated or developed in a manner that serves to protect or enhance fish habitat in the WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area. Provisions of the plan relating to habitat must be based or rely on existing laws, rules, or ordinances created for the purpose of protecting, restoring, or enhancing fish habitat. Such existing laws, rules, or ordinances include the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW), the Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A RCW), and the Forest Practices Act (Chapter 76.09 RCW). Planning activities under Chapter 90.82 RCW must also be integrated with strategies developed as part of other processes undertaken in response to potential or actual listing of salmon and other fish species as being threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act. In WRIAs or portions of WRIAs where habitat restoration activities are being developed and implemented under the Salmon Recovery Act (Chapter 77.85 RCW), such activities must be relied upon as the primary nonregulatory habitat component for fish habitat in the watershed plan.

b) If there is no mandated approach, what type of approaches could reasonably achieve the objectives?

Planning conducted under Chapter 90.82 RCW provides a process to allow the local citizens within a WRIA or a multi-WRIA planning area to join together in an effort to assess the status of the water resources of their management area, and to determine how best to manage those resources. Thus, there may be considerably variability from WRIA to WRIA regarding the manner in which planning units attempt to achieve the objectives identified in Section 2b of this Nonproject Review Form.

c) Why was the approach presented in the proposal selected?

The proposal is consistent with the approach to watershed planning established by the Washington State Legislature and codified in Chapter 90.82 RCW.

5) Public, Agency, and Tribal Involvement

a) Who are the known primary stakeholders?

As noted above in Section 1f above, watershed planning conducted under Chapter 90.82 RCW may be initiated for a WRIA only with the concurrence of the initiating governments within the WRIA. The initiating governments include: all counties within the WRIA, the largest city or town within the WRIA, and the water supply utility obtaining the largest quantity of water from the WRIA. The aforementioned entities must invite all tribes with reservation lands within the WRIA to participate as an initiating government.

In cases where a watershed planning area consists of multiple WRIsAs, the initiating governments include: all counties within the multi-WRIA area, the largest city or town within each WRIA, and the water supply utility obtaining the largest quantity of water from each WRIA. As with single WRIA planning efforts, the aforementioned entities must invite all tribes with reservation lands within the multi-WRIA area to participate as an initiating government.

The initiating governments for a WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area are responsible for organizing the planning unit that will be responsible for development of the watershed plan. Although Chapter 90.82 RCW does not contain specific requirements for composition of a planning unit, it does stipulate that in selecting members for a planning unit, initiating governments must “provide for representation of a wide range of water resource interests.”

Composition of the planning unit may vary considerably from WRIA to WRIA because of differences in the nature and extent of specific beneficial uses of water, or the level of stakeholder interest in water resource related issues, or both. Examples of planning members could include, but are not limited to, representatives of:

- Cities, public water supply utilities or districts, or irrigation districts in addition to those designated as initiating governments;
- Federal agencies such as the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and U.S. Forest Service;
- State agencies such as the Department of Ecology, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Health, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Transportation, Office of Community Development, Conservation Commission, and Parks and Recreation Commission;
- Local agencies such as county or city planning departments, public works department, and local health jurisdictions;

- Sewer districts, conservation districts, flood control districts, and other local governmental or quasi-governmental organizations;
- Tribes with reservation lands within a WRIA engaged in watershed planning;
- Tribes with treaty fishing rights within a WRIA undergoing watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW;
- The public at large;
- Business interests such as developers, builders, timber and forest products industries, shellfish industry, commercial fishing industry, chambers of commerce, and other industrial organizations and associations;
- Agricultural interests including farmers and ranchers;
- Recreational interests including sport fishing groups and organizations, whitewater rafting groups, and kayaking groups;
- Environmental organizations; and
- Watershed councils, Salmon Recovery Lead Entities, or similar watershed related organizations.

It should be noted that 12 state agencies entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) regarding their roles and responsibilities in supporting watershed planning. Under the MOU, Ecology coordinates the participation of the 12 departments and agencies in local watershed planning efforts including providing information and technical assistance to planning units.

b) What other jurisdictions are involved and for what reasons?

Although not required under Chapter 90.82 RCW, some planning units have designated agencies, tribes, or organizations that are not primary stakeholders in the watershed planning process, but nonetheless wish to be or should be kept apprised of that process, as “ex-officio” or non-voting members or granted them “interested party status.” In this manner, the non-voting member or interested party has ongoing opportunities to provide input to the planning process.

c) What types of processes will be used for soliciting, evaluating, and documenting input from stakeholders, agencies, tribes, and the public?

Since by law, planning units are to be comprised of a wide range of water resource interests, they serve as the primary forum for soliciting, evaluating, and documenting input from stakeholders, agencies, tribes, and the public.

Watershed management plans are subject to review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Chapter 43.21C RCW). As such, stakeholders, agencies, tribes, and the public can comment on any SEPA document or documents prepared in support of a watershed plan. In addition, the jurisdictional legislative authority for each county within a WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area must hold at least one public hearing on the draft watershed plan for the planning area.

Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public will be invited to provide comments on the scope of the statewide nonproject environmental impact statement (EIS) for watershed planning, including alternatives, probable significant impacts, and mitigation measures. Similarly, comments will be solicited regarding the Draft EIS prior to preparation of the Final EIS.

6) Existing Environment

a) Generally describe the existing environmental landscapes (i.e., status or quality of ecosystem) likely to be affected if the proposal is implemented. Include a description of the existing environment where resulting “on-the-ground” activities may occur and adjacent areas and facilities likely to be impacted.

The environmental landscape of Washington State varies widely from region to region. A general description of the existing environment within Washington State follows.

(i) Earth

The far western portion of Washington State is part of the Coast Range region. The coast range consists of the Willapa Hills of southwest Washington and the Olympic Mountains, which extend north from the Chehalis River valley and form the Olympic Peninsula. The Puget Trough, a structural depression that extends the length of the state, lies to the east of the Coast Range. The Puget Trough is generally flat, but in places is characterized by hummocky glacial deposits. A substantial portion of the northern half of the trough is occupied by Puget Sound, an estuary of the Pacific Ocean.

East of the trough is the geologically complex Cascade Range. This range, which extends the entire length of the state, separates western Washington from eastern Washington. The most prominent geographic feature in the southeast portion of the state is the Columbia Plateau. The plateau is an extensive basin formed by numerous basalt flows. Deeply incised trenches have been cut into the plateau by the Columbia and Snake Rivers. Portions of southeast Washington are occupied by fertile, windblown dust called loess.

The northeast portion of the state is occupied by several mountainous areas including the Okanogan Highlands, the Kettle River Range, and the Selkirk Mountains, a portion of the Rocky Mountain Range.

(ii) Air

Washington's climate varies dramatically from west to east with the western part of the state having a mild, humid climate and the eastern part a relatively cool and dry climate. The North Pacific Current offshore of western Washington and associated warm maritime air masses help to moderate the area's temperatures.

Western Washington has frequent cloud cover and considerable fog and rain. Portions of western Washington lying on the west side of the Olympic Mountains receive as much as 160 inches (400 centimeters) per year of precipitation, making that area the wettest in the 48 conterminous states. Precipitation in the Puget trough is much less, typically in the range of 40 to 50 inches (100 to 125 centimeters) per year with approximately 60-80 percent of that total falling in the six-month period between October and March. Areas of western Washington that experience the rain shadow effect of the Olympic Mountains have significantly less rainfall. For example, average annual precipitation for the City of Sequim is a scant 16 inches (40 centimeters).

Precipitation increases dramatically near the Cascade Mountains. Palmer, a site approximately 20 miles west of the Cascade crest, receives an annual average of 90 inches (225 centimeters) of precipitation. In an average year, Snoqualmie Pass, located at the Cascade crest, receives a water equivalent of 104 inches (260 centimeters) of precipitation, although much of that precipitation falls in the form of snow.

Temperatures in western Washington are moderate. Typical average maximum temperatures in July for western Washington are about 70 degrees (F) in coastal areas, and five to ten degrees warmer inland. Average minimum temperatures in July are generally in the low to mid-50s (F). Average maximum temperatures in January are in the mid-40s (F) with average minimum temperatures in the low 30s (F).

As previously noted, the climate of eastern Washington is dry. Many portions of eastern Washington receive less than 10 inches (25 centimeters) of total annual

precipitation, and much of that precipitation falls in the form of snows. Total precipitation approaches 20 inches (50 centimeters) per year in areas closest to the Cascade Range and the Selkirk Mountains.

Temperature ranges in eastern Washington are more extreme than those of western Washington. Characteristic average maximum temperatures in July are in the mid-80s (F) to near 90 degrees (F). Average minimum temperatures in July are generally in the mid- to upper 50s (F). Average maximum temperatures in January are in the low to mid-30s (F), except in southeast Washington where the average maximum temperatures are closer to 40 degrees (F). Average minimum temperatures in January are typically in the teens to mid-20s (F).

(iii) WATER

The Columbia River, the largest river in the western United States, drains the eastern portion as well as part of the southeastern portion of Washington. Because of the large volume of water conveyed by the Columbia River and substantial elevation drops along its course, a number of hydroelectric dams have been constructed on the river, including 11 in Washington State. As such many reaches of the Columbia are controlled pools or artificial lakes behind dams, such as Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake behind Grand Coulee Dam. The largest tributary of the Columbia, the Snake River, is also highly developed for hydroelectric power generations with four dams in operation within Washington State alone. Other major tributaries of the Columbia River in eastern Washington, listed from upstream to downstream, include the Pend Oreille, Spokane, Sanpoil, Okanogan, Methow, Chelan, Entiat, Wenatchee, Yakima, Walla Walla, Klickitat, and White Salmon river systems. Washington tributaries of the Columbia River in the reach flowing from the Cascade Range divide to the Pacific Ocean include the Wind, Washougal, Lewis, Kalama, Coweman, Cowlitz, Elochman, and Grays river systems.

A number of large western Washington river systems discharge to Puget Sound including, from north to south, the Nooksack, Skagit, Stillaguamish, Snohomish, Duwamish-Green, Puyallup, Nisqually, and Deschutes. Similarly, several river systems flow into the western arm of the Puget Sound estuary, Hood Canal, including the Quilcene, Dosewallips, Duckabush, Hamma Hamma, and Skokomish.

Rivers on the north end of the Coast Range region flow into the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which connects Puget Sound with the Pacific Ocean. These include the Dungeness, Elwah, Lyre, and Hoko rivers systems. Rivers on the west side of the Coast Range region flow directly into the Pacific Ocean or embayments of the ocean such as Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay. These include the Ozette, Soleduc, Hoh, Queets, Quinalt, Humptulips, Chehalis, and Willapa river systems.

The state has numerous fresh water lakes, the largest of which is Lake Chelan, an approximately 55-mile long glacial lake in north central Washington.

(iv) PLANTS

The flora of western Washington is dominated by coniferous forests. On the west side of the Olympic Mountains extending south to the Columbia River is a temperate rain forest consisting primarily of Sitka spruce, western red cedar, and western hemlock. The floor of the forest has a dense coverage of ferns and mosses. Further inland on the southern, eastern, and northern borders of the Olympic Mountains are more open forests dominated by Douglas fir, Sitka spruce, and western hemlock with a shrub understory.

The flora of the Puget Trough, extending to the western slopes of the Cascade Range, consists primarily of coniferous forests comprised of Douglas fir, western hemlock, and western red cedar with a shrub understory. Approaching the Cascade Range, the dominant tree species transition to a combination of Douglas fir, Grand Fir, and Pacific silver fir, and then to noble and subalpine fir.

The east slopes of the Cascade Range are covered by coniferous forests consisting of a mixture of Douglas fir, white pine, and in places western larch. This type of forest also occupies the northern border of the state extending to the Idaho border. In an easterly direction from the Cascade Range and in a southerly direction from the northern border, the forest quickly transitions to extensive ponderosa pine forests with sparse shrub understories. The central portion of eastern Washington, including the Columbia Plateau, is a shrub-steppe environment dominated by sagebrush and short grasses. The southeast portion of eastern Washington, the Palouse Hills, consists of a prairie occupied by tall grasses.

In both western and eastern Washington, wetland and riparian vegetation serve as an important component of the flora.

(v) ANIMALS

The wildlife of Washington State is very diverse. In the forests and mountains are bear, elk, cougar, bobcat, lynx, mule and whitetail deer, and mountain goat. A few areas of eastern Washington are inhabited by bighorn sheep and antelope. Smaller mammals include beaver, marten, muskrat, porcupine, several species of squirrel and chipmunk, and gopher.

Washington's bird population includes crow, western lark, goldfinch, grouse, quail, and a number of owl species. Numerous raptors are native to Washington including bald and golden eagle as well as a wide variety of hawk species. Shore and marsh birds include seagulls, terns, sandpiper, cormorants, a number of duck species, Canada goose, and heron.

The states coastal waters are host to shrimp, oyster, clams as well as halibut, red snapper, and rock fish. The states waters are home to a number of anadromous fish including several salmon species and steelhead. A number of anadromous species have been listed as threatened or endangered by the National Marine Fisheries Service under the federal Endangered Species Act. Table 2 lists threatened or endangered species for which critical habitat has been identified within individual WRIAs.

Rainbow trout and sturgeon are the principal non-anadromous fish species in the state's rivers and streams. One trout species, the bull trout, has been listed as threatened by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the federal Endangered Species Act. The entire State of Washington is within the designated boundaries of either the Coastal/Puget Sound or the Columbia River bull trout population segment. However, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service currently lacks sufficient data to delineate critical habitat within those designated boundaries.

TABLE 2
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT LISTED FISH SPECIES

WRIA	ESA LISTED FISH SPECIES
#1 Nooksack	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#2 San Juan	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#3 Lower Skagit	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#4 Upper Skagit	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#5 Stilliguamish	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#6 Island	**
#7 Snohomish	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#8 Cedar – Sammamish	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#9 Duwamish – Green	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#10 Puyallup – White	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#11 Nisqually	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#12 Chambers – Clover	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#13 Deschutes	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#14 Kennedy – Goldsborough	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#15 Kitsap	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#16 Skokomish – Dosewallips	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#17 Quilcene – Snow	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#18 Elwha – Dungeness	- Puget Sound chinook (T) **
#19 Lyre – Hoko	**

(T) Threatened (E) Endangered

** The entire State of Washington is within the designated boundaries of either the Coastal/Puget Sound or the Columbia River bull trout population segment; both are listed as threatened. However, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service currently lacks sufficient data to delineate critical habitat within those designated boundaries.

TABLE 2
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT LISTED FISH SPECIES

WRIA	ESA LISTED FISH SPECIES
#20 Soleduc	- Sockeye (T) **
#21 Queets – Quinault	**
#22 Lower Chehalis	**
#23 Upper Chehalis	**
#24 Willipa	**
#25 Grays – Elochoman	- Columbia River chum (T) - Lower Columbia River chinook (T) **
#26 Cowlitz	- Columbia River chum (T) - Lower Columbia River chinook (T) - Lower Columbia River Steelhead (T) **
#27 Lewis	- Columbia River chum (T) - Lower Columbia River chinook (T) - Lower Columbia River Steelhead (T) **
#28 Salmon – Washougal	- Columbia River chum (T) - Lower Columbia River chinook (T) - Lower Columbia River Steelhead (T) **
#29 Wind – White Salmon	- Columbia River chum (T) - Lower Columbia River chinook (T) - Lower Columbia River Steelhead (T) **
#30 Klickitat	- Mid-Columbia River steelhead (T) **
#31 Rock – Glade	- Mid-Columbia River steelhead (T) **
#32 Walla Walla	- Mid-Columbia River steelhead (T) **

(T) Threatened (E) Endangered

** The entire State of Washington is within the designated boundaries of either the Coastal/Puget Sound or the Columbia River bull trout population segment; both are listed as threatened. However, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service currently lacks sufficient data to delineate critical habitat within those designated boundaries.

TABLE 2
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT LISTED FISH SPECIES

WRIA	ESA LISTED FISH SPECIES
#33 Lower Snake	- Snake River chinook (T) - Snake River steelhead (T) **
#34 Palouse	**
#35 Middle Snake	- Snake River chinook (T) - Snake River steelhead (T) **
#36 Esquatzel Coulee	**
#37 Lower Yakima	- Mid-Columbia River steelhead (T) **
#38 Naches	- Mid-Columbia River steelhead (T) **
#39 Upper Yakima	- Mid-Columbia River steelhead (T) **
#40 Alkali – Squilchuck	**
#41 Lower Crab Creek	**
#42 Grand Coulee	**
#43 Upper Crab Creek	**
#44 Moses Coulee	**
#45 Wenatchee	- Upper Columbia River chinook (E) **
#46 Entiat	- Upper Columbia River chinook (E) **
#47 Chelan	**
#48 Methow	- Upper Columbia River chinook (E) **
#49 Okanogan	- Upper Columbia River chinook (E) **

(T) Threatened (E) Endangered

** The entire State of Washington is within the designated boundaries of either the Coastal/Puget Sound or the Columbia River bull trout population segment; both are listed as threatened. However, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service currently lacks sufficient data to delineate critical habitat within those designated boundaries.

TABLE 2
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT LISTED FISH SPECIES

WRIA	ESA LISTED FISH SPECIES
#50 Foster	**
#51 Nespelum	**
#52 Sanpoil	**
#53 Lower Lake Roosevelt	**
#54 Lower Spokane	**
#55 Little Spokane	**
#56 Hangman	**
#57 Middle Spokane	**
#58 Middle Lake Roosevelt	**
#59 Colville	**
#60 Kettle	**
#61 Upper Lake Roosevelt	**
#62 – Pend Oreille	**

(T) Threatened (E) Endangered

** The entire State of Washington is within the designated boundaries of either the Coastal/Puget Sound or the Columbia River bull trout population segment; both are listed as threatened. However, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service currently lacks sufficient data to delineate critical habitat within those designated boundaries.

Sources: <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov> (salmon and steelhead species); <http://pacific.fws.gov> (bull trout).

(v) Land Use

Land use in Washington State is highly diverse. Portions of the Cascade Range and the Olympic Mountains are dedicated to federally owned wilderness areas, national parks, national recreation areas, and national forests. The national forests are managed for multiple uses including commercial timber production and recreation. Private forest lands are common in these mountainous areas as well as in the coast range and northeast Washington.

The lowlands of Puget Sound are heavily urbanized and include some of the state's largest cities such as Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, Bellingham, Bremerton, and Olympia. Areas around Spokane, Richland, Kennewick, Pasco, Yakima, and Wenatchee in eastern Washington are also characterized by urban levels of development. These urbanized areas are host to much of the state's population, as well as its manufacturing, commercial, and service industry base.

The state is also the site of extensive agricultural development. In western Washington, agricultural development is concentrated in the major river valleys, particularly those in the Puget Sound Region. Major portions of Eastern Washington have been developed for agricultural production. The Yakima, Wenatchee, and Okanogan River Valleys are host to large scale irrigated agriculture, as is the Columbia Basin in the central part of eastern Washington. Southeast Washington is extensively developed for dry-land farming of primarily wheat. Land use within the state's WRIAs is briefly characterized below in Table 3.

Counties and cities that have experienced significant growth over the last several decades are required to prepare comprehensive plans under the state's Growth Management Act (Chapter 36.70A RCW). That act requires affected cities and counties to designate their rural areas and urban growth areas and to conduct capital facilities planning to ensure that adequate public facilities are provided concurrent with future growth within designated urban growth areas. The Growth Management Act also requires all counties and cities to develop and adopt development regulations to protect critical areas such as wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, and aquifer recharge areas.

Development within shoreline areas is governed under shoreline master programs adopted pursuant to the state's Shorelines Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW). Local master programs, which must be approved by Ecology, are intended to protect shorelines from development and to require mitigation of impacts where appropriate.

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#1 Nooksack	Whatcom (94%) Skagit (6%)	1,039,238	148,300	Bellingham, Ferndale, Lynden, Blaine, Everson,	Urban – 6% Agriculture – 10% Range – 3% Forest – 76% Other – 5%
#2 San Juan	San Juan (100%)	399,625	12,300	Friday Harbor	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 5% Range – 1% Forest – 53% Other – 39%
#3 Lower Skagit	Skagit (94%) Whatcom (4%) Snohomish (2%)	474,226	91,699	Mount Vernon, Anacortes, Sedro- Woolley, Burlington, La Conner	Urban – 9% Agriculture – 25% Range – 1% Forest – 65%
#4 Upper Skagit	Whatcom (39%) Skagit (38%) Snohomish (23%)	1,565,856	3,711	Darrington, Concrete	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 7% Forest – 92%
#5 Stilliguamish	Snohomish (73%) Skagit (27%)	459,938	16,955	Arlington, Stanwood, Granite Falls,	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 8% Range – 3% Forest – 86%
#6 Island	Island (100%)	332,471	68,900	Oak Harbor, Coupeville, Langley	Urban – 7% Agriculture – 6% Range – 1% Forest – 27% Other – 39%
#7 Snohomish	Snohomish (51%) King (49%)	1,221,817	290,747	Everett, Marysville, Mukilteo, Monroe, Lake Stevens	Urban – 6% Agriculture – 4% Range – 3% Forest – 83% Other – 4%
#8 Cedar – Sammamish	King (80%) Snohomish (20%)	442,791	1,216,924	Seattle, Bellevue, Kirkland, Renton, Redmond	Urban – 45% Agriculture – 1% Range – 1% Forest – 53%
#9 Duwamish – Green	King (100%)	372,463	478,508	Seattle, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, Auburn	Urban – 26% Agriculture – 7% Range – 1% Forest – 66%

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#10 Puyallup – White	Pierce (87%) King (13%)	674,272	449,059	Tacoma, Puyallup, Enumclaw, Bonney Lake, Sumner	Urban – 9% Agriculture – 10% Range – 3% Forest – 79%
#11 Nisqually	Pierce (58%) Lewis (25%) Thurston (17%)	492,954	9,975	Eatonville, Roy, Yelm, Dupont	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 7% Range – 4% Forest – 86%
#12 Chambers – Clover	Pierce (100%)	109,626	355,206	Tacoma, Lakewood, University Place, Fircrest, Steilacoom	Urban – 47% Agriculture – 3% Range – 2% Forest – 33% Other – 15%
#13 Deschutes	Thurston (90%) Lewis (10%)	189,721	179,184	Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, Rainier	Urban – 17% Agriculture – 10% Range – 3% Forest – 70%
#14 Kennedy – Goldsborough	Mason (85%) Thurston (15%)	244,833	40,874	Shelton	Urban – 7% Agriculture – 1% Range – 1% Forest – 91%
#15 Kitsap	Kitsap (57%) Pierce (22%) Mason (13%) King (8%)	632,055	230,334	Bremerton, Port Orchard, Bainbridge Island, Poulsbo, Gig Harbor	Urban – 18% Agriculture – 2% Range – 2% Forest – 78%
#16 Skokomish – Dosewallips	Mason (59%) Jefferson (41%)	406,396	5,565	None	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 1% Forest – 82% Other – 15%
#17 Quilcene – Snow	Jefferson (86%) Clallam (14%)	401,002	23,801	Port Townsend	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 22% Range – 1% Forest – 57% Other – 17%
#18 Elwha – Dungeness	Clallam (82%) Jefferson (18%)	650,549	179,184	Port Angeles Sequim	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 14% Range – 1% Forest – 68% Other – 15%

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#19 Lyre – Hoko	Clallam (100%)	494,359	2,156	Neah Bay	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 2% Range – 2% Forest – 47% Other – 48%
#20 Soleduc	Clallam (65%) Jefferson (35%)	770,178	6,719	Forks	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 1% Forest – 92% Other – 5%
#21 Queets – Quinault	Jefferson (56%) Grays Harbor (43%) Mason (<1%)	749,709	1,284	Taholah	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 1% Range – 1% Forest – 96%
#22 Lower Chehalis	Grays Harbor (84%) Mason (15%) Jefferson (<1%) Pacific (<1%) Thurston (<1%)	907,637	65,333	Aberdeen Hoquiam Montesano Elma Ocean Shores	Urban – 5% Agriculture – 2% Range – 1% Forest – 92%
#23 Upper Chehalis	Lewis (60%) Thurston (24%) Grays Harbor (11%) Pacific (4%) Cowlitz (1%)	827,515	40,830	Centralia Chehalis Tenino Napavine Bucoda	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 13% Range – 1% Forest – 83%
#24 Willipa	Pacific (83%) Grays Harbor (16%) Lewis (<1%) Wahkiakum (<1%)	734,106	20,800	Raymond South Bend Long Beach Ilwaco	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 2% Range – 1% Forest – 78% Other – 17%
#25 Grays – Elochoman	Wahkiakum (56%) Cowlitz (26%) Pacific (17%) Lewis (1%)	322,582	61,659	Longview Cathlamet	Urban – 4% Agriculture – 4% Range – 1% Forest – 83% Other – 8%
#26 Cowlitz	Lewis (57%) Cowlitz (27%) Skamania (13%) Pierce (2%) Yakima (1%)	1,597,566	34,882	Kelso Castle Rock Morton Winlock Toledo	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 4% Range – 2% Forest – 89% Other – 3%
#27 Lewis	Skamania (49%) Cowlitz (26%) Clark (25%)	837,431	18,831	Woodland Ridgefield Kalama Yacolt	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 3% Range – 1% Forest – 90% Other – 3%

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#28 Salmon – Washougal	Clark (67%) Skamania (33%)	316,365	282,278	Vancouver Camas Washougal Battle Ground Ridgefield	Urban – 23% Agriculture – 14% Range – 3% Forest – 53% Other – 7%
#29 Wind/ White Salmon	Skamania (65%) Klickitat (31%) Yakima (4%)	576,745	14,528	White Salmon Stevenson	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 2% Forest – 93% Other – 3%
#30 Klickitat	Klickitat (58%) Yakima (42%)	918,850	10,267	Goldendale	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 13% Range – 9% Forest – 77%
#31 Rock – Glade	Benton (50%) Klickitat (44%) Yakima (6%)	1,057,998	64,521	Kennewick	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 49% Range – 37% Forest – 9% Other – 4%
#32 Walla Walla	Walla Walla (72%) Columbia (28%)	908,812	56,455	Walla Walla College Place Dayton Waitsburg	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 73% Range – 4% Forest – 15% Other – 6%
#33 Lower Snake	Franklin (57%) Walla Walla (39%) Columbia (4%)	461,472	Not Available	None	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 66% Range – 32% Forest – 1%
#34 Palouse	Whitman (62%) Adams (20%) Spokane (13%) Lincoln (4%) Franklin (1%)	1,765,345	47,238	Pullman Medical Lake Colfax Palouse Rosalia	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 67% Range – 26% Forest – 6%
#35 Middle Snake	Garfield (32%) Asotin (28%) Columbia (20%) Whitman (20%)	1,440,130	21,744	Clarkston Pomeroy Asotin Starbuck	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 41% Range – 36% Forest – 22%
#36 Esquatzel Coulee	Franklin (50%) Adams (33%) Grant (17%)	1,058,960	58,290	Pasco Othello Connell Mattawa Mesa	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 68% Range – 30% Forest – 1%
#37 Lower Yakima	Yakima (74%) Benton (24%) Klickitat (2%)	1,862,225	257,429	Yakima Richland Sunnyside Grandview Toppenish	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 30% Range – 53% Forest – 15%

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCE INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#38 Naches	Yakima (90%) Kittitas (10%)	709,990	3,006	Yakima Tieton Naches	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 5% Range – 12% Forest – 81%
#39 Upper Yakima	Kittitas (85%) Yakima (15%)	1,366,935	39,216	Ellensburg Selah Cle Elum Roslyn Kittitas	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 11% Range – 31% Forest – 54%
#40 Alkali – Squilchuck	Kittitas (48%) Benton (29%) Chelan (14%) Yakima (9%)	541,356	514	Richland	Urban – 2% Agriculture – 5% Range – 80% Forest – 12%
#41 Lower Crab Creek	Grant (66%) Adams (32%) Lincoln (2%)	1,622,130	56,435	Moses Lake Ephrata Othello Quincy Ritzville	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 69% Range – 27% Forest – 1%
#42 Grand Coulee	Grant (83%) Douglas (14%) Lincoln (3%)	482,825	8,384	Ephrata Soap Lake Grand Coulee Electric City Coulee City	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 45% Range – 50% Forest – 4%
#43 Upper Crab Creek	Lincoln (88%) Grant (8%) Spokane (2%) Adams (2%)	1,185,282	6,043	Medical Lake Odessa Wilbur Reardan Harrington	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 62% Range – 35% Forest – 2%
#44 Moses Coulee	Douglas (93%) Grant (7%)	730,029	21,897	East Wenatchee Waterville Rock Island	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 61% Range – 35% Forest – 3%
#45 Wenatchee	Chelan (100%)	877,392	53,055	Wenatchee Cashmere Leavenworth	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 2% Range – 7% Forest – 85% Other – 5%
#46 Entiat	Chelan (100%)	305,529	1,108	Entiat	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 6% Forest – 89% Other – 3%

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#47 Chelan	Chelan (98%) Okanogan (2%)	670,111	5,927	Chelan	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 3% Range – 6% Forest – 78% Other – 11%
#48 Methow	Okanogan (100%)	1,357,656	4,608	Twisp Pateros Winthrop	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 10% Forest – 84% Other – 4%
#49 Okanogan	Okanogan (100%)	1,344,550	28,855	Omak Okanogan Brewster Oroville	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 8% Range – 37% Forest – 52% Other – 2%
#50 Foster	Douglas (74%) Okanogan (26%)	578,182	7,703	Bridgeport Mansfield	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 39% Range – 53% Forest – 7%
#51 Nespelum	Okanogan (85%) Ferry (15%)	144,643	524	Nespelem	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 8% Range – 10% Forest – 76% Other – 5%
#52 Sanpoil	Ferry (67%) Okanogan (33%)	628,128	3,904	Republic	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 1% Range – 7% Forest – 91%
#53 Lower Lake Roosevelt	Lincoln (63%) Ferry (23%) Okanogan (14%) Grant (<1%)	326,198	6,348	Davenport Coulee Dam Elmer City	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 26% Range – 38% Forest – 31% Other – 4%
#54 Lower Spokane	Stevens (49%) Spokane (28%) Lincoln (23%)	568,799	41,670	Spokane Medical Lake Airway Heights	Urban – 3% Agriculture – 29% Range – 5% Forest – 62% Other – 1%
#55 Little Spokane	Spokane (62%) Pend Oreille (25%) Stevens (13%)	431,826	113,575	Deer Park	Urban – 5% Agriculture – 26% Range – 3% Forest – 66%

TABLE 3
WATER RESOURCES INVENTORY AREAS
LAND USE

WRIA	COUNTIES (% of total acres)	ACREAGE	POP. (approx.)	PRINCIPAL CITIES	LAND USE (% of total acres)
#56 Hangman	Spokane (95%) Whitman (5%)	289,833	56,035	Spokane Cheney Tekoa Rockford Fairfield	Urban – 5% Agriculture – 64% Range – 1% Forest – 30%
#57 Middle Spokane	Spokane (93%) Pend Oreille (7%)	183,274	180,526	Spokane Millwood	Urban – 23% Agriculture – 16% Range – 4% Forest – 57%
#58 Middle Lake Roosevelt	Ferry (72%) Stevens (28%)	702,800	2,113	None	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 6% Range – 8% Forest – 81% Other – 4%
#59 Colville	Stevens (99%) Pend Oreille (1%)	650,482	31,668	Colville Chewelah Kettle Falls Springdale	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 13% Range – 2% Forest – 84%
#60 Kettle	Ferry (66%) Okanogan (24%) Stevens (10%)	654,844	2,804	None	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 3% Range – 13% Forest – 83%
#61 Upper Lake Roosevelt	Stevens (94%) Pend Oreille (6%)	370,061	2,012	Kettle Falls Northport Marcus	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 4% Range – 3% Forest – 89% Other – 3%
#62 Pend Oreille	Pend Oreille (97%) Stevens (3%)	794,546	10,700	Newport Ione Metaline Falls Metaline Cusick	Urban – 1% Agriculture – 4% Range – 2% Forest – 93%

Adapted from: Washington's Water Quality Management Plan to Control Nonpoint Sources of Pollution, Appendix A, Washington Department of Ecology Publication # 99-26, January 2000.

7) Broad Impacts

a) In meeting the primary objective (identified in 2b), is it likely that the nonproject action will direct an agency to develop or construct projects?

Local watershed plans will contain recommended actions, which upon adoption by the jurisdiction county legislative authority or authorities, may become obligations for state and local agencies, provided that the affected agencies are on record as accepting the obligations. The recommended actions could involve a variety of construction projects related to water quantity, water quality, and habitat. Limitations on the specific nature of recommended actions were previously presented in Sections 3 b), and 4 a) (ii) of this nonproject review form.

b) In meeting the primary objective, is it likely that the nonproject action will encourage physical changes to the natural or built environment?

Since the primary objective of the Chapter 90.82 RCW is to supply water in sufficient quantity to satisfy instream flow needs of fish and to provide water for future out-of-stream uses, it is likely that local watershed plans developed under that chapter will encourage changes to both the natural and built environment.

c) What is the location (geographic area) where changes will be directed or encouraged? Include the area directly affected, as well as adjacent or other areas where changes will be indirectly encouraged.

Changes will likely be encouraged in every watershed in which watershed planning is or will be occurring under Chapter 90.82 RCW. Refer to Table 1 for a list of WRIAs within which watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW is occurring.

d) Will this action constrain certain activities or development, but not preclude all activities or development?

Local watershed management plans will likely contain recommended actions that are intended to constrain or preclude activities or development practices that are potentially detrimental to fish habitat or water quality, or that involve inefficient use of the state's water resources. This may involve recommended changes to critical areas ordinances, shoreline master programs, comprehensive land use plans, coordinated water system plans, and reclamation and irrigation district plans.

8) Key issues/questions, alternatives, impacts, and mitigation.

a) Identify key issues/questions.

The proposal represents numerous local watershed planning efforts that are occurring or will be occurring in various WRIAs and multi-WRIA planning areas around the state. While a number of key issues were discussed in Section 2 d) of this Nonproject Review Form, many others will be identified by local planning units. The statewide nonproject environmental impact statement for watershed planning will identify key issues involved with watershed planning, will identify alternative solutions to those key issues, and will discuss the impacts and mitigation measures associated with such alternatives.

b) Identify alternative solutions.

All local watershed plans must include a water quantity component and may include instream flow, water quality, and habitat components. To arrive at a final set of recommended alternatives, each planning unit will need to consider a number of different alternatives for each watershed issue to be addressed.

For each of the aforementioned watershed plan components, the statewide nonproject environmental impact statement (EIS) for watershed planning will evaluate a range of alternatives for addressing key issues. The identification of issues and alternatives to be discussed and evaluated in the EIS will be based on input received from local lead agencies and planning units.

(i) How would each alternative solution likely direct, encourage, or enable:

• New development?

New residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural development may be enabled by recommended actions that serve to increase availability of water for out-of-stream uses, or that alleviate concerns over aquatic habitat and water quality impacts.

• Redevelopment?

Actions recommended by some watershed plans will likely promote redevelopment that serves to make more water available for instream uses; improve water quality; and protect, improve, or restore aquatic habitat.

- **Changes in land use?**

Actions such as voluntary water transfers to instream uses may promote conversions in land uses. For example, a transfer of water to instream use that was previously used for irrigation of crops may require conversion of part or all of the land to which the water was previously applied to another use. The conversion could be to a less water-intensive land use, or could involve return of the land to open space.

Conversely, water made available through storage projects or storage enhancement projects may result in additional agricultural, residential, commercial, or industrial development.

- **Changes in density of use?**

Density of residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural development may be affected by availability of water supply. Increased availability may stimulate increased density of use, while decreased availability may necessitate lower density of use. However, decreased availability of water can be partially offset by conservation and water use efficiency improvements.

- **Changes in management practices?**

Watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW is intended to positively influence the management of water resources within the state by ensuring that the state's water resources are used wisely, by protecting existing water rights, by protecting instream flows for fish, and by providing for the economic well-being of the state's citizenry and community. As such, local watershed plans will seek to enhance a wide range of water use and land use management structures.

(ii) What are the likely impacts from the changes?

The statewide nonproject EIS for watershed planning will evaluate the impacts of local watershed plans on various water use and land use management plans, policies, and practices, as well as on the entities responsible for administration of such plans, policies, and practices.

(iii) What are the potential mitigation measures for these impacts?

The statewide nonproject EIS for watershed planning will evaluate methods for mitigating the impacts of local watershed plans on various water use and land use management plans, policies, and practices, as well

as to the entities responsible for administration of such plans, policies, and practices.

(iv) Will the intent of the proposal still be met if these impacts occur?

Recommended actions of local watershed plans must be consistent with the objectives and provisions of Chapter 90.82 RCW.

c) What preliminary decisions were made regarding key issues?

Initiating governments in each potential WRIA or multi-WRIA planning area must make a collective decision as to whether they want to engage in watershed planning within the framework of Chapter 90.82 RCW. Those that elect to proceed with watershed planning are required under Chapter 90.82 RCW to form a planning unit and to determine the scope of the watershed planning effort. While all watershed plans must include a water quantity component, inclusion of an instream flow, water quality, or habitat component is at the discretion of the initiating governments.

d) Which alternatives will be carried forward for further analysis?

The alternatives to be included in the statewide nonproject environmental impact statement (EIS) for watershed planning will be developed based on input from local lead agencies and planning units. As such, the alternatives should represent a broad range of possible recommended actions that may or will be considered as part of local watershed planning efforts.

The decision as to which alternatives will be carried forward for further analysis as part of each local watershed planning effort will be made by individual planning units within the framework established under Chapter 90.82 RCW.

e) For those alternatives not carried forward, please describe why not

Some alternatives will not be carried forward because either they do not meet the objectives of Chapter 90.82 RCW or of the local watershed planning effort, or they are not considered by a planning unit to be “reasonable” as defined in Chapter 197-11 WAC.